REMARKS

Favorable consideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 were in the application, claims 19-25 were previously withdrawn, claim 1 has been amended, claim 3 has been cancelled and new claims 21-112 have been added.

The examiner indicated that claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12-17 were objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 3 therein, and claims 1, 2 and 14-17 are no believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 and claim 6 have been presented as new claim 27, with claims 28-41 dependant therefrom.

Claim 1 and claim 7 have been presented as new independent claim 42, with claims 43-55 dependant therefrom.

Claims 1 and 9 have been presented as new independent claim 56, with claims 57-68 dependant therefrom.

Claims 1 and 10 have been presented as new independent claim 69, with claims 70-80 dependant therefrom.

Claim 1, 11 and 12 have been presented as new independent claim 81, with claims 82-94 dependant therefrom.

Claims 1 and 14 have been presented as new independent claim 95, with claims 96-106 dependant therefrom.

Claim 26 has been amended to include a step limitation corresponding to the limitation of claim 10 therein and being of corresponding scope is believed to place claim 26 in condition for

allowance.

New claim 107 repeats original claim 26 and incorporates a step limitation corresponding

to allowed claim 7, and new claim 107 and the claims dependant therefrom are also considered to

be in condition for allowance.

Based on the above amendments, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 8, and 11 for anticipation,

and of claims 4, 18 and 26 for obviousness are believed to have been rendered moot.

Claims 26 and 107 are clearly not rendered obvious over Suzuki as Suzuki fails to teach or

suggest the dimmer function step of amended claim 26, or the comparing step of new claim 107.

In view of the above, favorable consideration and removal of the grounds for rejection are

respectfully requested. However should the examiner believe that direct contact with the

applicants attorney would advance the prosecution of the application, the examiner is invited to

telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Sapone

Registration No. 32,518

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Coleman Sudol Sapone P.C. 714 Colorado Avenue

Bridgeport, CT 06605

Telephone No. (203) 366-3560

Facsimile No. (203) 335-6779

17